

**From:** echrist690@earthlink.net@inetgw  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/26/02 9:43pm  
**Subject:** Microsoft Settlement

My name is Ellie Drew. I am president of the Institute for Conscious Change in Tucson, AZ. I wish to thank all of the public servants in the DOJ for their excellent work in pursuing the Anti-trust case against MS.

However the currently proposed remedy fails to even address its own stated intents. Please consider all of the findings in the case against MS in modifying the Revised Proposed Final Judgment and come up with a new remedy which addresses these findings and the current RPFJ's stated intents.

I include here considerations for bringing the RPFJ into accord with the case findings, the RPFJ's stated intents and reasonable remedy given the nature of the situation. My views are substantially the same as those in the comment filed by Robert E. Litan, Roger D. Noll, and William D. Nordhaus. Where I differ in view is in the number and degree of separations. In number: I urge you to require all non-Operating Systems code (using the traditional definition from Computer Science and overseen by an independent panel of university professors doing Operating Systems research) be removed from the ownership of and access by the Divested OS companies. The resulting removed assets would be passed "over the wall" to one of three independent Application companies. These Application companies would be delineated into "client applications", "server applications", and "development tools." Failure to comply with this divestiture within a one year time frame would result in the code for all products found not to have been appropriately apportioned be placed in the public domain. In degree: I urge a new Final Judgment that requires all of the resulting divested companies to make freely available for use all APIs, component/application interfaces, protocols, and other interconnections at the time of the decree and in perpetuity. Where any existing outside standards exist for any of these interfaces all divested companies would be required to implement -without extension or modification- these standards while removing interfaces which overlap any standards within a two year time frame. Failure to comply would result in the code used to implement any non-conforming interfaces be placed in the public domain. In addition all applications produced by the divested companies must be marketed and sold separately for a period of seven years. Failure to comply (such as bundling or tying in software components of different companies or components of the same company) would result in the code of the affected software component being placed in the public domain. These remedies and penalties for non-compliance are just and due given the egregious nature of the defendants crime and behavior.

Sincerely,

Ellie Drew